



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0462NY-2 for Clinton-Essex-Warren-Washington BOCES

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides a somewhat adequate and brief overview of the activities that have been implemented (i.e., professional development workshops for teachers and principals, calibration workshops, data analysis workshops) in the area of professional development as it relates to the Common Core Learning Standards.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>The applicant fails to adequately articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform visions that builds on the four core educational assurances. There are no details on how the applicant will recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals. No detailed plan for hiring teachers has been outlined. It is not clear how the applicant will turn around the lowest-performing schools as details on the I-STAY project lacks specificity and only indicates generically that the project will align technology resources with the Common Core Standards without providing details on the types of activities and how they will result in deepening student learning. There does not appear to be a detailed plan for building a data system that measures student growth and success as the I-LEARN system indicated in the narrative appears to be an on-line/virtual classroom system with no details on how the project will measure growth.</p> <p>Overall, this places Clinton-Essex-Warren-Washington Board of Cooperative Educational Services at the bottom of the medium range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant does a good job of describing their approach to selecting schools that included presentations to 17 of the school districts that met the minimum qualifications. Of the 17 schools approached, 15 of the districts agreed to participate, with the majority of the schools already in progress of implementing reforms as a result of the New York State Race to the Top funding. Moreover, the applicant indicates that more than 40% of the students across all the participating schools are from low-income families as evidenced by the charts indicating low-income ranges from 18%-59% with the majority of the schools having ranges of 40% and above. Moreover, the number of students per school are provided in charts highlighting those students who are low-income and/or high needs.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant does a great job of describing the population it is proposing to serve and place the applicant in the high range in this section.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant does an adequate job of describing an existing program titled Safe Schools/Healthy Students that serves as a regional model of building a collaborative interdisciplinary network that works to create sustainable system change over a period of years. In fact, the applicant indicates that in the last four years, five of the schools involved in the initiative have</p>		

transformed their school environments. As a result, the applicant will use the strategies employed in the Safe Schools program to scale-up the initiatives in the I-STAY project that has been designated as the model of reform for the proposed project.

**Weakness:**

The applicant fails to adequately address the sub-criterion. There is no Theory of Change or Logic Model presented to determine how the applicant will scale-up the project to meet meaningful outcomes. Much of the information on the strategies that have or will be explored lack specificity and do not resemble a high-quality plan of implementation. There does not appear to be a strategy for LEA-wide reform and change. For example, the applicant indicates that personalized learning strategies that support student outcome goals will be embedded into every classroom, every school, and every district across the region without providing details on the types of learning strategies. Moreover, the applicant indicates that data-driven instruction will increase through data-collection systems, without providing details in the narrative on how data will be collected and/or analyzed. The I-STAY project design does not provide many specifics to determine if the proposed model has scale-up possibilities.

Overall, this section scores in the low medium range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant does a good job of describing the current student performance levels on state mandated tests. Overall students in grades 3-8 are performing at proficient or above in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math with the majority of students at 50% or above with one school at 100% and the majority of the other schools ranging from 59%-85%. The area of concern for the applicant is students in the upper grades whose master levels in Algebra ranged from 2%-57%, further demonstrating a need for targeted intervention services in the area of Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM).

The goals for the project are reasonable and quite achievable based on the current progress students are making as evidenced by the high mastery scores in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science in the lower grades. The areas where students are struggling will be addressed through professional development activities per the applicant.

**Weakness:**

The applicant does not sufficiently describe the activities that will be employed to decrease the achievement gaps and/or raise the graduation and college enrollment rates from the current 88% average. While the applicant provides goals of 1% increase annually for each of the target schools. Some of the schools are performing at such high levels that a one percent increase does not appear very ambitious. With the amount of funds requested and the historical data provided on graduation and college enrollment rates, the proposed one percent is highly achievable and a more ambitious goal should be provided.

Overall, this applicant scores in the medium range for this sub-criterion.

**B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)**

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly demonstrates a record of success over the last four years in improving student outcomes as the baseline data provided on college enrollment and graduation rates and state mandated tests show high percentages that range from 50% -100%. As a State that received Race to the Top State funds, the rollout of training on the Common Core Standards started two years ago and included training for regional facilitators who will participate in the proposed Race to The Top District program. Additionally, the applicant indicates that data will be accessible to all districts and will be shared through academic intervention monitoring reports, 5-week progress reports and report cards, newsletters, parent reports, open houses, and school websites.

The applicant does an excellent job of highlighting the strategies that resulted in improved academics for students in high

poverty schools that include mandatory 90-minute reading blocks for K-6 students, required reading courses for 7th graders, targeted small group study block for 7th and 8th graders, high school specialists in core elementary classes, and math and reading centers in K-12 schools. Additionally, the applicant has implemented peer tutoring programs, school-based mental health clinics, and remedial/accelerated reading and math programs.

**Weakness:**

It's not clear that parents without technology resources are able to engage in access information about performance data. The tools described for reporting all appear to be technology-based, which could be challenging for low-income families who do not have access to technology resources.

Overall the applicant scored in the high area.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant indicates that a high level of transparency exists as it relates to sharing data as all achievement, financial, and demographic data is available to stakeholders annually. Additionally, the applicant provides a list of the processes and procedures used for each of the target school districts that include providing budget updates at monthly faculty meetings, board meetings and on the school website. Additionally, the applicant indicates that faculty at some of the districts are active participants in fiscal and budget planning with community members invited to budget workshops and public presentations.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fails to adequately describe the types of data that is made available (i.e. actual personnel salaries) as there are no details on the description of the budget items that are provided for each school. Additionally, there are no details in the budget narrative for this proposal on salaries for staffing, only overall numbers. More details are needed on the types of data made public are needed to determine the level of transparency.

Overall, this section scores in the medium range.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant does a good job of highlighting their previous experience customizing education plans, offering flexible scheduling, implementing differentiated learning centers, offering online educational opportunities, and implementing theme, project-based learning, and collaborative small group instruction. Additionally, the applicant assisted in the development of the State Race-to-The Top mathematics toolkit which is directly aligned and linked to the Common Core Learning Standards. Moreover, the connection to the state will provide the applicant the flexibility and autonomy to implement a wide range of instructional initiatives.

Overall this section is rated very high.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4
---	----	---

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a brief overview of the 15 consortium schools sought stakeholder feedback during the development of the proposal and that a formal development team led by the superintendent was created to review project objectives. The development team includes teachers, principals and school staff with additional input sought from a key partner in the proposal (i.e. Safe Schools/Healthy Schools). Additionally, the applicant provides a list of the stakeholders and their district and project-wide letter of support.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not adequately address or supply evidence that teachers were actively engaged in providing feedback on the proposal. There does not appear to be a letter of support from the bargaining unit and/or evidence that at least 70% of teachers support the proposal. While the applicant indicates that feedback and support from parents and parent organizations was sought, there are no details on if the proposal was revised to reflect their thoughts. No details are provided on what type of engagement was sought and/or if the regional development team that was led by the superintendent included parents and/or community stakeholders and the list of team members appears to only include school staff.

Overall this section is rated a low medium.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a list of specific plans and strategies from each of the schools in the proposed project and how they are currently implementing the project that includes promoting the development of student learning profiles include goals, and establishing consistent work/college readiness skills strategies.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to adequately address this selection criterion. There are no details on the specific gaps and weaknesses at the target schools. It is not clear that the applicant has conducted an analysis of how personalized learning environments are being implemented in the target schools. Moreover, it is not clear what if any gaps and needs have been identified.

This section is rated very low.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant does a good job of describing how they will determine best methods for teaching by determining how students learn best. Students will be administered a survey to identify strengths, weaknesses, and learning goals. Upon review of the assessment, the teachers and students will work collaboratively to co-design their learning based on the common core standards. To ensure that students are learning in what is most comfortable, the applicant will implement social networking platforms that will remove the geographic barriers to learning. This is an excellent strategy and will provide students with opportunities to learn using technology resources.</p> <p>The applicant provides opportunities for students to learn using a variety of strategies that include blended courses, synchronous and asynchronous interactions, and through work-based learning activities. Throughout the implementation process, the applicant will ensure that students have access to the necessary supports through open professional development in the classroom and online.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>While the applicant has indicated that technology will be implemented ensuring that all students have access to a laptop, netbook, or other handheld devices, there are no details on how they will ensure proficiency. Much of the information provided focuses on what the applicant proposes to do as opposed to what they have already decided to implement and/or what they have done in the past that has not worked. The applicant fails to address all aspects of a high-quality plan that includes timelines, key personnel, goals, and activities.</p> <p>Overall, this section is rate in the low range of high.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p>		

The applicant does a good job of describing the strategies for ensuring that teachers and principals receive the necessary professional development to implement the proposed project objectives. The applicant has identified a number of strategies that include hiring 15 coaches to offer embedded and online professional development opportunities, intensive summer institutes, project-based learning, and professional learning communities. Moreover, the applicant indicates that professional development activities will include a focus on the classroom environment to ensure that the structure of the classroom is conducive to learning.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fails to adequately address this selection criterion as there are no details on the applicant's plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Moreover, there are no details on the district's teacher evaluation system and/or information on the training for teachers and principals on closing the achievement gap. The applicant fails to address a high-quality plan that includes goals, activities, timelines, and key personnel.

Overall, this section is rated a medium.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant briefly indicates that all schools will have leadership teams that support the development of budgets, schedules, and instructional models with flexibility for shared planning and professional development. One area of strength that the applicant will implement in the district is regional training for all staff who are responsible for evaluating teachers and/or principals to ensure that they are connecting evaluations to the state standards.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>It is not clear that the school leadership teams includes external stakeholders (i.e., parents, community organizations) and/or students. The description of the leadership teams appear to consist only of superintendents, educators, and principals. It is difficult to determine how the applicant will ensure buy-in by community partners and parents if they are not represented or part of the redesign. Moreover, there are no details on how students will be given opportunities to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery as this information is not clearly defined. While the applicant indicates that they will have access to learning resources founded in the PLE toolkit, what those resources are have not been clearly described.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant fails to adequately address the LEA practices and policies that will provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students.</p> <p>This section is rated a low medium.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant does a good job of describing how resources will be allotted on a per student costs as it relates to enhancing their technology infrastructure. Moreover, the applicant indicates that within 90 days of the start of the project that a technology assessment will be completed for each school, and provide regional and individual training support for all coaches, administrators, lead teachers, and district-level technology staff.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>The applicant fails to adequately address this selection criterion as there are no details on how the applicant will ensure that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school. The applicant provides a chart with the name of the LEA, the type of technical support and the PLE infrastructure with no details on how this will allow parents and students to engage and/or extrapolate information. It is difficult to determine how the applicant will ensure a high-quality project implementation plan as the entire section lacks specificity in this area.</p>		

This section is rated low.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant briefly describes their plan for regular feedback that includes collecting rubric data three times per year, and creating a link from classroom teacher to district teams to the regional project..</p> <p><b>Weakness:</b></p> <p>The applicant fails to adequately address this sub-criterion as there are no details on their strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements throughout the grant period and/or after it ends. There are no strategies identified for monitoring, measuring and/or publicly sharing information on the status of their investments in professional development strategy and/or technology.</p> <p>This section is rated very low.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides sufficient information on the plan to ensure ongoing communication that includes e-blasts sent on a monthly basis, postings the website, and through information submitted in newsletters. Additionally, the applicant indicates that press releases will be sent to local newspapers, radio and television stations, and updated on the community calendars. There are a number of strategies ensuring communication of information.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>While the applicant provides a list of activities that will be implemented to share information, it is not clear how they will engage families and/or internal staff to assist with continuous improvement with the overall plan. More details are needed on stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>This section is rated high.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides sufficient data on the baseline and projected goals for reducing the achievement gaps in English Language Arts and Math that show increases in reducing the gap by a minimum of 3% each year with 17% over the life of the grant.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>The applicant fails to adequately address this selection criterion as the information provided on performance measures for the ACE camp students that show know baseline and project numbers of 75% for each year with no growth for 7th-9th graders. Moreover, with no baseline data provided it is difficult to determine if the proposed objectives are ambitious. The performance measures for highly effective teachers and principals for all students shows a maximum of 12% highly effective teachers at the end of the grant period, which is a low percentage. Additionally, there is no data on the baseline and/or baseline and projected percentages for students in the subgroups for any of the measures.</p> <p>This section is rated very low.</p>		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does a sufficient job of describing their plan to evaluate effectiveness as it relates to reaching project objectives that includes tracking and reporting on progress towards meeting the stated objectives. The applicant indicates that the project administrator will work with the core management team (i.e. superintendent) to monitor all fiscal resources and track expenditures.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>It is not clear that the project will hire an evaluator to determine strengths and challenges of the project as there are no details on how the applicant will provide for a formative and summative evaluation model. The plan for evaluating effectiveness lacks specificity as there are no clear details on how the applicant will ensure that technology purchased will be used productively and/or how the use of time, staff, money, or resources are being used to meet the stated performance measures. More details are needed on how the proposed technology purchases will result in improvement and/or project effectiveness.</p> <p>This section is rated very low.</p>		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	1
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant provides an overall budget amount for each of the initiatives along with a total budget.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The applicant fails to provide a budget narrative that fully describes how funds will be used for the project. The narrative provided is generic and lacks specificity. There is a total cost indicated for each project initiative (i.e., I-STAY, I-Learn) with no details on how the funds will be expended.</p> <p>This section is rated extremely low.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant provides a brief overview of how they proposed to sustain the project through infrastructure, professional development, and ongoing regional support. The strategy includes using the first two years to enhance technology infrastructure in order to implement professional learning communities.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The applicant fails to provide a detailed plan for sustainability as it relates to finances and/or professional development. There does not appear to be a strategy for implementing a train the trainer process and/or model. The applicant has indicated that professional development will be a large part of the overall project design and no resources appear to be directed towards ensuring that the lessons learned and information gathered is continued once the project ends.</p> <p>This section is rated very low.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The applicant has highlighted the existing partners and aligned with the project component and services. There are a number of institutions that are providing in-kind mental health services.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>The applicant fails to adequately describe how they will engage parents and families of students in the decision-making process as it relates to improving results. Moreover, it is not clear of how they will create a decision-making process and/or infrastructure to evaluate supports that address the individual needs of student participants. There are no details on how the applicant will track indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all participating students. There are no details on how the applicant will ensure that educational results and other education outcomes are articulated or defined.</p> <p>Overall this sections rates very low.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>Overall the applicant does not adequately describe how they will ensure a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on the four core educational assurances. As stated previously, there are no details on how the applicant will recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals. No detailed plan for hiring teachers has been outlined. It is not clear how the applicant will turn around the lowest-performing schools as details on the I-STAY project lacks specificity and only indicates generically that the project will align technology resources with the Common Core Standards without providing details on the types of activities and how they will result in deepening student learning. There does not appear to be a detailed plan for building a data system that measures student growth and success as the I-LEARN system indicated in the narrative appears to be an on-line/virtual classroom system with no details on how the project will measure growth.</p> <p>This section rates extremely low.</p>		

Total	210	102
-------	-----	-----

## Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides an optional budget, however there are no details on how this proposed budget will be used to create a high-quality plan that would be co-developed and implemented across two or more LEAs. The applicant indicates that the bus will be assigned to schools based on availability. There does not appear to be a coherent plan for implementation and no real detail on the budget required to implement the proposed STEM bus.</p> <p>This section has been rated zero.</p>		





# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0462NY-3 for Clinton-Essex-Warren-Washington BOCES

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Clinton-Essex-Warren-Washington Board of Cooperative Educational Services (CEWW BOCES) is leading a consortium of fifteen school districts in an initiative called I-STAY. The 15 districts participating in New York's RTTT effort believe this initiative will deepen the RTTT work. Although the group does not meet the technical definition of rural, it is located in and around the foothills of the Adirondack Mountains and has fewer than 6 students per square mile. I-STAY speaks to the nature, not the technical definition, of the districts.</p> <p>The overall goal of the I-STAY project is to improve college and career readiness by infusing Tom Wagner's Seven Survival Skills throughout all programs and creating effective personalized learning environments. The seven skills (i.e., 1. critical thinking &amp; problem solving; 2. collaboration across networks; 3. agility &amp; adaptability, 4. initiative &amp; entrepreneurialism, 5. effective oral &amp; written communication, 6. accessing &amp; analyzing information, 7. curiosity &amp; imagination) are actualized in seven initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I-Learn: learner-centered and self-directed with learner accessing necessary tools and resources</li> <li>• I-Coach: sustained professional development for educators from Survival Skills Coaches who provide training on project based learning.</li> <li>• I-Work: personal and portable career learning plan.</li> <li>• I-Pitch: entrepreneurial experiences.</li> <li>• I-Improve/Motivate: support services for struggling students based on community resources providing enrichment activities.</li> <li>• I-Care: mental health and addiction clinics.</li> <li>• I-Connect: school based social worker to ensure every student is connected to home and home.</li> </ul> <p>I-STAY has a clear and robust vision of the kind of experience school should offer students. The proposal is bursting with descriptions of possibilities. For example, in the "Synchronous and Asynchronous Interactions" section it describes how students will be able to complete their work anytime/anywhere and meet with the teacher one-on-one or in small groups. They would be able to create slideshows, tutorials, subscribe to blogs, share tools and resources through a social network, and take courses independently on a platform like Moodle.</p> <p>What is missing is clarity around what each district is actually doing and how this vision becomes real. For example, providing anytime/anywhere learning wherein students meet with the teacher one-on-one or in small groups has huge implications for staffing and school schedules. The nuts and bolts of these shifts are never discussed.</p> <p>Medium-high points are awarded for I-STAY's comprehensive vision. The lack of clarity about how the vision is actualized is the source of weakness in this section.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CEWW BOCES presented the RTT-D grant opportunity to its 17 districts; 15 superintendents agreed to participate. Superintendents helped develop the I-STAY framework.</p> <p>This proposal includes a complete list of schools and their demographics related to high needs and poverty. 42% of the students come from low-income homes.</p>		

I-STAY earns full points for this section.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

It appears that all 15 districts are implementing all seven initiatives in all schools through a variety of activities. Some activities (i.e., students participating in a "social" platform) are common across districts and schools. Others activities are specific to districts. There is a short discussion about how most of the initiatives within I-STAY will be scaled up by first implementing an initiative at a specific grade level and then scaling it to other grade levels.

Information about the initiatives will be shared with nonparticipating districts in the region (parochial, private, and charter) by sharing aggregate data through local media, mailings, press conferences, and websites.

Medium points are awarded because of the lack of specifics or, perhaps, simply lack of clarity about how initiatives start and scale in specific schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The I-Step consortium identifies three subgroups: special education, English Learners, and low-income. It does not include information specific to the three subgroups by school, by district, or across the consortium. It does not use these subgroups to calculate gaps, but rather treats each school as a subgroup.

To be clear, I-Step provides data related to (a), (b), (c), and (d) for the total population of each of the participating schools. It presents school-wide percentages of student scoring proficient or above on relevant measures (e.g., Grade 4, NYS ELA Assessment; Grade 8, NYS Mathematics Assessment; Comprehensive English Regents) and then compares those proficiency percentages to state wide proficiency percentages.

I-Step sets very ambitious targets to close the gap between school and state proficiencies. It not clear if these targets are reasonable. For example:

- Westport lags the state by 32% on the Grade 8 Mathematics Assessment: I-Step will eliminate this gap by the 2014-15 school year
- Moriah lags the state by 21% on the English Regents: I-Step will eliminate that gap during the 2012-13 school year.

I-Step earns low points because it fails to use student subgroups as defined in this notice.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

I-STAY is a consortium of 15 districts that have a clear track record of previous success. The districts have embraced New York's RTTT effort and expect the following shifts in practice:

- All teachers in P-8 will implement CCLS (Common Core) aligned instruction.
- All teachers in 9-12 will develop and implement CCLS-aligned units and build content capacity.
- Evaluators will be looking for evidence of 12 specified shifts (e.g., writing from sources and academic vocabulary in English language arts; focus, coherence, and rigor in mathematics).

(a) The proposal reports past successes for each of its participating districts. For example:

- Westport CSD closed the gap in reading/ELA score with 100% of its students passing the English and math Regents
- Chazy improved graduation rates from 78% to 92%
- Saranac CSD increased the percentage of students with disabilities meeting proficiency by 13%
- Beekmann CSD implemented RTI during the past 4 years with the result that now more than 94% of it students are meeting the English Regents

(b) This criteria does not apply to the districts in the consortium. No schools in any district meet the criteria for “persistently failing.” Only two schools in the consortium, one each from two separate districts, are classified as “focus.”

(c) The proposal does not share how districts make student data available, which is the point of (c).

Clinton receives fairly low points for two reasons. It is clear from the information shared that each of the 15 districts is improving student achievement in one or more ways, but it is not clear that each of the 15 districts is making progress on all four of the required indicators (a). No information is provided related to making student data available (c).

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All of the districts in I-STAY share detailed financial, demographic, and student achievement data with stakeholders on an annual basis. Some districts do more (e.g., pair budget information releases with back to school night; involve faculty and community in budget building).

All districts have begun submitting data into New York State’s Information Repository System, which regularly reports 114 elements of information.

I-Step earns medium points because it is not definite that the information listed in (a), (b), (c) and (d) are included in the available data. Neither is it clear that the information is readily available to all stakeholders.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

I-STAY appears to have all necessary autonomy. Its plan does not include components that go beyond the autonomy that already exists in New York so no waivers are necessary. For example, I-STAY does not seek to uncouple seat hours and credits earned. Instead, I-STAY intends to do things like incorporate project based learning, student-directed learning, mastery/proficiency-based learning and access to online remedial coursework, all of which can be done within the existing statutory and regulatory requirements.

I-STAY earns full points because it has sufficient autonomy to implement its proposal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

9

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CEWW BOCES led the development of I-STAY. Superintendents from all districts, along with teachers, councilors, and principals worked collaboratively to create the plan. Every district had some type of outreach to stakeholder groups. The teacher union president of every district signed a letter of support. The proposal contains letters of support from universities, members of Congress, chamber of commerce, and sheriff’s departments. There is no evidence that 70% of the teachers support this effort. A letter is referenced, but cannot be found.

Lower points are awarded since the proposal includes a description of how the proposal was developed, but that process does not include stakeholders such as parents, teachers and students; nor is it clear that teachers support the effort.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Internet accessibility and access to technology are critical to the success of I-Step. It will conduct a formal infrastructure analysis across the 15 districts within 3 months of receiving the grant. It will establish a shared regional standard to promote equity.

Districts currently support extended learning in a variety of ways. I-Step will ensure personalized learning across the districts through its various initiatives. For example:

- Beekmantown CSD will create more programs for non-college bound students through I-Work.
- Chazy CSD will provide improved student access to technology and easier connections to social programs.
- Moriah CSD will promote individualized student project and focus on college and career readiness skills.
- Westport CSD will develop student learning centers such as elementary reading and mobile science lab.

This proposal discusses conducting a formal infrastructure audit, but does not define the attributes that will be audited and so earns slightly less than full points.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

### (C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The I-STAY districts are committed to allowing “students access anytime/anywhere, redefine the role of the teacher, incorporate project based learning, student-directed learning, mastery/proficiency-based learning and access to online remedial coursework,” but there is no coherent high-quality plan. There are certainly elements of a high-quality plan (e.g., related to the I-Work initiative, the proposal states that, “As the program is implemented in Year 1, in order to insure that each student has access to the necessary supports by parents and educators, the I-Work Coordinator and District Site Coordinators will orient all stakeholders about the I-Work program goals to generate student, parent, board member, employer and educator interest.) but too many elements are scattered or incomplete. For example, the proposal states that a “social” networking component will be required of all P-12 students and educators to build knowledge from each other” and yet the proposal simply states that, “Prior to implementation, the district will work with the I-STAY technology coordinator to establish goals and design professional development.” Without belaboring the point, some elements of a high-quality plan exist for some of the initiatives and activities, but no where is there a clear and concise plan that matches key goals with activities, timelines, deliverables and responsibilities.

#### (a)

Sections (i) and (ii) are addressed in the proposal. Students are given tangible supports (e.g., every student will have access to a laptop, netbook, or other handheld device) and new responsibilities (e.g., All P-12 students are required to participate in a “social” networking platform, work with teachers to co-design a personal learner platform, produce an I-portfolio by his or her senior year with evidence that he or she is ready for career and college).

Much attention is paid to collaborative, project-based learning and opportunities related to shadowing and interning. The idea of students deeply involved in their own learning infuses the proposal (iii). There is no explicit mention of (iv) exposure to diverse cultures or perspectives, although this is a natural outgrowth of online activity.

This proposal is bursting with descriptions of possibilities. For example, in the “Synchronous and Asynchronous Interactions” section it describes how students will be able to complete their work anytime/anywhere and meet with the teacher one-on-one or in small groups. They would be able to create slideshows, tutorials, subscribe to blogs, share tools and resources through a social network, and take courses independently on a platform like Moodle. There will be required social networking platforms, career coaches, virtual career fairs and more. The skills described in (v) are thoroughly addressed in the Academies .

#### (b)

Sections (i), (ii), and (iii) are addressed in this proposal. Each student will have his or her own learning plan, developed with a teacher. Teachers will be trained on ways to increase communication with homes and to involve parents in their students’ educational planning. The PLE handbook in the appendix lists potential platforms and content that will be made available to students.

There is too little clarity around (iv). The proposal does not specify what kind of data a student might see, if any. While there are many examples of how a student might show mastery in interesting ways (e.g., virtual presentations) and there is the expectation that teachers “link student activities to the Common Core,” there is no description of how that information is collected and incorporated into the student’s learning plan.

There is no discussion of high-need students (v) and no clear mention of training students to use the technology (c). I-STAY technology coordinators will establish goals and design PD for teachers, but students (and their parents) are not addressed in any detailed way.

This section earns medium points. There is a clear commitment to and plan for personalized learning. There are two important

areas that are not described well enough that are core to the project success: access to data and support for high-need students. Most important, the proposal lacks a high-quality plan that leads to actualizing the goals.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal lacks some elements of a high quality plan. It outlines many activities that are a part of such a plan, such as:

- "The I-Coach initiative will invest in 15 Survival Skills Coaches to offer embedded and online professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators."
- "Educators will participate in intensive summer institutes to learn how to implement various strategies to insure our students are prepared for college or the world of work."
- It will model its approach on Colorado Springs' comprehensive plan.

But the specifics of who, when, and how that are part of a high quality plan are missing for some of its seven initiatives.

The proposal includes descriptions of approaches to develop capacity at both educator and school levels. For example:

- Survival Skills Coaches (master teachers on special assignment for four years) will work with In-District Coaches using a trainer of trainers approach.
- In-District Coaches will support teachers and administrators through embedded and online professional development opportunities.
- Teachers will participate in intensive summer institutes. In addition to Survival Skills, educators will be trained in project-based learning, data-driven instruction, learning styles, mastery learning, the Networked Teacher and the Learning Zone. Additional topics are mentioned in the training graphic: STEM, technology integration, career clusters, poverty, Common Core Learning Standard, assessments, teacher/leader effectiveness. (It must be that different districts are focusing on different topics, since this is too much content to cover in a 2-week summer institute.)
- Teachers will use the "Personalization Chart" (in the appendix) to self-evaluate and to make a plan to personalize learning in their classroom.
- Teachers will be offered the opportunity to become "Networked Teachers" through embedded professional development in an online learning environment.
- Teachers have the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues using ITEACHY.
- Every district will conduct the School Self Review for each building.
- Each school will then build a strategic plan aligned to I-STAY's vision.
- Educators will have access to a variety of tools, platforms, and programs that vary across districts.

Again, missing are the implementation details that would turn this list of important activities into a measurable and actionable high-quality plan.

New York State has developed a robust data system for collecting, storing and reporting. All participating districts will submit student data and teacher/leader data. Additionally 12 of the districts use My Learning Plan (OASYS) that offers the ability to schedule, manage, complete and report all components of the evaluation process for teachers, principals, support staff, etc. It handles data related to classroom observation, informal walkthroughs, peer reviews, student learning objectives, and student growth data.

Given the complexity of the criteria in this section, it is reasonable that not every element is fully addressed. For example, the ability to match processes and tools to student needs is not explicitly described. Nor is it not clear what the personalized learning plan each student creates for him or herself looks like or if and how it changes over grade levels. Yet, in both of these cases, so much attention has been paid to the topic, these feel like minor oversights in the description.

This section falls short in three ways, and so is awarded low points.

First, as described above, it misses many elements of a high quality plan.

Second, while there seems to be a lot of data collected, but how that data is used by whom for what is not clear. It is never clear that students or their parents can access any of this information. While a clear (and genuine) commitment to continuous improvement is described, explicit use of data is very thinly developed compared to other aspects of the proposal. For example, there is no discussion of a systematic way to frequently measure student progress beyond the identified large scale assessments. There are many possible methods listed that allow students to demonstrate learning (e.g., slide shows, blogs) but there is no description of how that information becomes part of the students personalized learning plan or if a learning plan is adjusted based on student exhibitions of learning. Similarly, it is not clear how resource effectiveness is judged.

Third, component (d) is not addressed. While there are established targets related to increasing the percentages of highly effective and effective educators, there is no specific plan to do this. Hard to staff schools and subjects is not discussed.

For these reasons, I-STAY earns medium points.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>I-STAY addresses some but not all of the components of this section.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a clear organizational structure for this project. CEWW BOCES will head it; the management team will be comprised of the superintendent (or his or her designee) from each district. There are school leadership teams in all 15 districts.</li> <li>There is no discussion of granting flexibility to schools.</li> <li>There is no discussion of the elimination of seat time.</li> <li>There is a robust description of the possibilities that students might have to show mastery. Clearly a lot of thought and time has gone into thinking about possibilities.</li> </ol> <p>There is no specific attention paid to students with disabilities or English learners.</p> <p>Medium points are earned.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) I-STAY will provide each district with \$625 per student to upgrade technology infrastructure. There is a commitment to provide every student with technology (e.g., iPad, hand held device) and, depending on the district, a variety of online tools and content. There is a list of possible content and resources in the PLE toolkit found in the appendix.</p> <p>(b) Teachers are well supported and appear to be responsible for making sure their students learn the technology needed.</p> <p>(c) There is no certainty that parents and students will be able to export information. Parent access and training is only mentioned in the proposal with the following statement: "districts will include training and on-going support [to meet the] needs of their students, educators, and parents and include those needs in their project implementation plans."</p> <p>(d) Interoperability is not discussed. However, since all the districts in I-STAY depend on a single New York State system and 12 of the districts use the same local data collection program, this should not be an issue.</p> <p>I-STAY earns medium points because it fails to ensure parent and student access and because it lacks clarity related to system interoperability.</p>		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Project Administrator and Core Management Team will develop a rubric to provide timely and regular feedback. Data will be collected 3 times per year and the results reported to the I-STAY Advisory Board, along with recommendations. Missing is a consistent strategy to share information with those who are most directly affected. Additionally:</p>		

- District Implementation Readiness Rubric will be administered annually.
- Behavioral data related to school climate will be collected.
- Project coordinators will link classroom teachers to district teams to regional project.

This section earns medium points. Missing is a full feedback loop that ensures that feedback goes to those actually doing the work and able to make on-the-ground adjustments.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is a high level plan to disseminate information via newsblasts, district websites, and press releases. There does not seem to be a systematic way to “engage” internal or external stakeholders for meaningful participation.

Medium points are awarded because listening to feedback and reactions from internal and external stakeholders is missing.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

I-STAY uses a mix of measures to gauge the effect of the project on academic and behavioral measures.

Additionally it will evaluate the strength of implementation for each of the seven initiatives. It does not provide information or targets for subgroups as defined in the proposal. It does not provide baseline data for schools as it did throughout the proposal. It does provide baseline data and targets for the consortium as a whole.

Also missing element is a description of “how it will review and improve the measure over time” required in (c). To be clear, the proposal includes charts of appropriate performance measures as required by this criteria, but it does not provide a rationale for those measures nor does it speak to how those measures will be evaluated and, perhaps, adjusted or revised.

Medium points are awarded because I-STAY does identify sufficient and reasonable measures, but it does not provide information for sub-groups or a way to monitor the effectiveness of measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CEWW BOCES will be the fiscal agent. It has the experience and wherewithal to provide the necessary oversight for all expenditures. However, the (E)(4) criteria speaks to monitoring the effectiveness of funded activities. There is a commitment to create a plan to monitor effectiveness of project components.

Since no plan exists, and the plan to create such a plan are vague, medium points are awarded.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
Although CEWW BOCES will provide office space and support for program staff, there are no funds beyond RTT-D dollars committed to this project.		

This proposal contains a well-explained budget overview, but does not include a line-by-line budget that explains how the money will be spent in any detail. Although the total dollar amounts seem reasonable and sufficient, it is hard to judge the reasonableness of the budget without more detail. It is hard to judge overhead costs when the overhead rate is not included. It is hard to judge the allocation of \$625 per student for technology since the technology audit has not been completed. (Related to this particular budget item is the issue of equity. This expenditure is described as increasing equity across the districts. If some districts need to create bandwidth or add connectivity while other districts are adding extra smartboards and additional computer labs, this expenditure does not lead to equality. It is not at all certain this is the case because there is no information.)

It is difficult to determine which costs are one-time-only (i.e., \$625 per student for technology) and which costs are ongoing (e.g., TOSA positions). While it is not hard to make these assumptions, the budget narrative does not clearly classify expenditures as one-time or ongoing.

I-STAY earns low points because it does not include a line item budget.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no commitment of funds or activity to this project after the 4 year grant period. I-STAY believes the initiatives will continue because four years will allow them build the necessary technological infrastructure and provide the necessary training to educators to change the culture.</p> <p>Medium points are awarded. Despite the richness of the I-STAY vision, there is no research to support accomplishing this kind of dramatic shift in culture and climate within a four year period.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>One of the I-STAY initiatives is I-Care, which seeks to establish school-based mental health and addiction clinics.</p> <p>During the past 4 years, five consortium districts have established community partnerships with Clinton County Adolescent Services, Behavioral Health Services North or Essex County Mental Health and to provide school-based mental health services. These are essential satellite offices so families are billed on a sliding scale, making the services affordable.</p> <p>Students with the highest behavioral needs can be screened by school staff using a "Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire." Student confidentiality is protected with 10 digit student identification number when data is shared between the mental health provider and the school. Parents must agree before provider shares information specific to a particular student.</p> <p>I-STAY wishes to expand this program by bringing drug abuse clinics onto middle and high school campuses, beginning with the schools with the highest number of students in need of services.</p> <p>The project sets academic targets for grades 3 to 8 (improvement on either ELA or mathematics scores on state tests) and behavioral targets (decrease number of times students are sent to office) for all grades. Interesting to note there is no academic target for grades 9 – 12. It is curious that no academic targets are set for high school students.</p> <p>Given that there is no budget associated with this specific aspect of I-CARE and that some aspects of the criteria [(3)(b), (3)(c), (3)(d), (5)(b) and (5)(e)] are missing, medium points are awarded.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met



### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Although this proposal is missing important components (e.g., systematic access to and use of data), it has a fully developed vision of creating an individualized educational experience for students that is engaging and worthy. It has a well-described set of activities that would prepare teachers and schools to provide an environment in which students are responsible for determining and achieving their own path to college and career readiness.

Total	210	129
-------	-----	-----

### Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0

### Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

I-STAY includes a description of a Magic STEM Bus equipped with the latest technology and 3 educators prepared to deliver "exciting series of hands on/minds on STEM activities." The bus will provide labs and carry special STEM guests/experts. It will serve all 15 I-STAY districts.

The bus will be assigned to schools, based on availability. The calendar will be posted online and schools can request to be scheduled. There will be outreach to ensure low-income parents and students know about the bus. Users will be invited to give feedback online and the results of that feedback will be used to improve services.

This section receives no points because there is no budget associated with this initiative.



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0462NY-4 for Clinton-Essex-Warren-Washington BOCES

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Clinton-Essex-Warren-Washington Board of Cooperative Educational (CEWW BOCES) has outlined a strategic and well organized plan to raise student achievement. The clear focused plan, I-Stay, has seven initiatives that will support their efforts to reform education. Listed below are the seven components of I-STAY:

- I-Learn (personalize the learning environment)
- I-Coach (survival skills coaches)
- I-Pitch (entrepreneurship)
- I-Work (career ready students)
- I-Improve/Motivate (pursue personal interest and academic success)
- I-Care (social and emotional development)
- I-Connect (connecting to my community)

The outlined plan set expectations for students and adults within the consortium. The comprehensive plan also empowers stakeholders to be active participants in creating personalized learning environments. I-STAY presents a plan to support the social and emotional development of all students and will provide all students with a career coach to assist with the development of career pathway projects. I-STAY is a comprehensive and coherent plan that will build of the work of the four core assurances. Full points have been awarded to the applicants.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

BOCES presented the RTTD grant opportunity to its 17 component school districts. The fifteen member consortium worked collectively on the P-12 initiatives. All schools within the participating districts are will be included in the project if the consortium is awarded RTTT-D funding. The proposal notes that the superintendents of each district worked collectively on the grant proposal. More than 40% of students across participating schools districts are from low income families. BOCES has provided compelling evidence of all participating school districts that support of the proposal. I-STAY will address reform in education for all students and will give greater emphasis to students in grades 4-12. The consortium estimates that an estimated amount of \$1,748 per student will be needed in RTTT-D for full program implementation.

Below is comprehensive information provided by the applicants on participating stakeholders:

The total number of students - 13,925

Total number of participating students from low income families – 5,964

Total number of high needs students – 6,277

Total number of participating educators – 1,771

Five of the 15 member consortium has worked together in the past on a safe schools and healthy students (SS/HS) project. BOCES has a well thought out plan to scale up the SS/HS project and model success efforts to the I-STAY project. Specific proposal expectations have been set to increase the use of technology, student achievement, and increase accountability within BOCES. BOCES plan to share models and outcome within the I-STAY initiatives with nonparticipating districts in the region. The vision and sale-up efforts of BOCES are ambitious. Full points have been assigned.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Past successes with the Our Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) project will be molded to lead scale up efforts within the I-STAY project.

The LEAs have goals to do the following:

- Increase technology
- Align learning standards
- Increase accountability through teacher/leader evaluation
- Increase data driven instruction through training, collaboration and support

The consortium does a sound job explaining their efforts to share and collaborate with other stakeholders. The models developed within the I-STAY initiatives will be shared with nonparticipating districts in our region including parochial, private, and charter schools.

The applicants note that outcome data will be shared with the community, business stakeholders, via local media, press conferences, mailings, and websites.

It is not clearly understood if each school will be uniformed in its practices. Clarity on how project goals will be implemented in each school district is needed. A theory of change model is not evident. Six points have been assigned.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

BOCES will incorporate common core standards into curricula. Scale and growth scores have been provided by the districts in

English and math. The written proposal includes adequate measures to compare each district's achievement scores with the state.

Realistic goals have been set to close achievement gaps. Goals to meet state proficiency levels in ELA for grades 4 and 8 are realistic. Infused technology, project based lessons, academic creative endeavors (ACE) camps for struggling learners and enrichment plans are all feasible plans to close achievement gaps.

Current average graduation rate within the LEAs is 88%. Plans to raise graduation rates are commendable and feasible. Most school districts have set targets above 90% upon completion of the grant cycle.

The LEAs report that current average college enrollment is 74%. The written vision provides comprehensive plans to engage student learners and provide each student with a career coach to develop a graduation plan. This plan is thorough and achievable.

BOCES goals to improve student learning outcomes are provided. Subgroup performance was not clearly addressed. Timelines for anticipated growth in all grade levels are achievable. BOCES has been assigned eight points for A(4).

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>BOCES has written their commitment to infuse common core standards into the curricula. Plans to share and monitor performance data are unique. BOCES will share academic intervention monitoring reports on 5<sup>th</sup>-week progress reports and report cards, via newsletters, grades 3-8 assessment parent reports at open houses and on school websites. The consortium reports that there are no persistently low-achieving/performing schools as defined in the RTT-D notice but did provide details on measures to raise achievement in all district schools including an elementary and middle school that are considered focus schools according to achievement definitions of the state of New York.</p> <p>Information on some achievement growth for each LEA has been provided but the LEA did not demonstrate it consistently across content areas. Each district in the consortium noted achievements within the last four years but there were no specific notations that were given with specific dates. Below is a highlight of some of the successes within the districts:</p> <p>Northern Adirondack CSD (NAC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the past four years, more than 97% of students met the state benchmark on the Integrated Algebra Regents and the percent of students with disabilities who scored 55% or above on the English Regents increased by 24%</li> </ul> <p>Willsboro CSD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the past four years the percent of students who met the state benchmark on the Integrated Algebra Regents increased by 13%. Students with disabilities who passed the English Regents increased 20%.</li> </ul> <p>Keene CSD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students who met the state benchmark on the English Regents went from 93% to 100% and from 82% to 100% on the Integrated Math Regents</li> </ul> <p>The availability of clear data for four years was not sufficiently described. BOCES has been assigned a rating of 13 points.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

### (B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

An extensive list of measures used to report LEA processes, practices, and investments have been included in this proposal. Each LEA submits student/teacher/principal data into the state's student information repository system (SIRS). Stakeholders

can obtain information through line item budget reports, school report cards, fiscal accountability reports, and NYS Comprehensive reports. Financial information is also shared with the public via district newsletters, board meetings agendas and notes, faculty meetings and annual mailings. Each district has appropriately noted how school level data is reported to the public. Below is a highlight of strong and sound evidence of high levels of fiscal transparency within some of the LEAs.

Moriah CSD – emails budgeting information to all parents

Chazy CSD – a budget interview is aired on a local television station

Ticonderoga – post fiscal information on television station

Documented details of transparency with the consortium are adequate. Full points have been assigned.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

BOCES is in a state that was awarded Race to the Top State funds. The consortium briefly describes efforts to provide training and ongoing support within instructional shifts offered to teachers and administrators that specifically aligns with the ELA and math shifts of the state. BOCES reports that there are 41 school based inquiry teams (SBIT) within the consortium that are designed to improve student achievement by coordinating/developing assessments, analyzing data and creating/modifying school action plans. Evidence of student reflection on performance of interim assessments has been reported.

State accountability expectations in New York have been mentioned throughout this proposal. Innovative learning environments that are unique to each member of the consortium have also been included in this proposal. Below is a highlight of what the LEAs are doing:

- Nothern Adirondack CSD – established online course offerings and operates an academic boot camp
- Chazy CSD – has a senior project that is required as part of senior English
- Saranac CSD – offers online courses and advanced placement classes
- Plattsburgh CSD – is one of five districts in the state to have participated in the NYSUT Innovation Fund Project

Sufficient autonomy has been described by the applicants. Full points have been assigned.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A Comprehensive table explaining how each LEA gained feedback and support from stakeholders has been included in the proposal. Each school provided evidence of feedback from parents through parent associations, forums and PTO meetings. However, feedback from students was not mentioned. A formal development team met over two months to create the I-STAY project. Participating stakeholders included appropriate representatives from all aspects of education. The regional team included superintendents from all LEAs, along with counselors, principals, teachers, and coordinators. The New York Statue United Teachers (NYSUT) and School Administrators Association of New York State (SAANYS) provided letters of support.

Thirty seven letters of support have been included in the proposal. The LEAs have provided letters formal wide range of stakeholders. Letters come from elected officials, police departments, educational consultants, cities within the LEAs, colleges and universities, foundations and local organizations that work within the LEAs.

Points have been deducted due to the lack of student involvement mentioned and sound evidence of 70% of teacher support in the creation of this proposal. A rating of seven has been assigned.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Key goals and activities are included within the high quality plan. BOCES notes that there is a heightened need to increase technological infrastructures. The consortium has written that they are committed to increase student personalized learning strategies to meet the needs of individualized students. Establishment of building school level data teams to identify and address gaps in student achievement is sound. An exhaustive list of strategies that will be implemented to identify and address student needs by LEA has been included. This list includes plans to increase technology, increase student engagement, decrease the dropout rate, increase graduation rates for all students and students with disabilities, and create science labs.</p> <p>The districts provided evidence of their needs and gaps. Full points have been assigned.</p>		

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>BOCES has developed a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support needed to graduate college and career ready. The LEAs have thoroughly described their commitment to providing each school with increased technology. This is a feasible goal but the LEAs have failed to provide adequate details on how low income students will pay to have access to internet activities in their home.</p> <p>A clear and focused plan to concentrate on the needs of the individual learner is evident in the proposal. Before learning begins, students will partake in inventory surveys on learning styles so that educators can identify the appropriate learning interest style that will later assist students to reach their full academic potential. In the proposal it is clear that students will drive their own learning and teachers will serve as facilitators.</p> <p>Included in the proposal is an innovative plan to provide synchronous and asynchronous interactions (blended courses) with incorporated use of technology and social media. Blended courses demonstrate the exhaustive efforts the LEAs have to diversify learning environments. Convincing evidence is mentioned on the variety of instructional approaches that heighten each student's ability to explore, reflect, and engage in open inquiry. The project development team created a toolkit to guide educators during the initial stages of implementation. I-Coach, one of the seven key components in the proposal, provides a plan to provide ongoing training and support to assist all educators in implementing personalized learning environment strategies.</p> <p>The LEAs have support from parents, educators and the business community to assist all students to be workforce ready. Each student in grades 4-12 will develop a personalized career plan and will be exposed to a career pathway cluster. This proposal included adequate details of opportunities for students to engage in work-based learning within the actual work environment. Students will be exposed to shadowing, internships, career camps, and forums. Below are other ambitious career readiness goals described in the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11<sup>th</sup> and 12 graders will receive preparation for National Work Readiness Credential (NWRC) exam</li> <li>• Technical endorsements on diplomas for CTE programs</li> <li>• Developmental classes for student who do not successful score well on Accuplacer exams</li> <li>• Mandate that all teachers be highly qualified and pass exams that students are expected to pass to be work force ready</li> </ul> <p>The plan to assist struggling learners is feasible. Camps are described to allow students to catch up during NYS Regents week, spring break and one Saturday a month. Also, parents of identified students being at risk in grade seven will receive additional orientation for camps.</p> <p>The plan to collaborate with local universities that assist with project-based learning is sound.</p> <p>Critical thinking and creatively ideas are comprehensive. The LEAs I-Pitch component is a truly unique and innovative plan to encourage student innovation and collaboration amongst the business community. The described initiative creates competition within the LEAs where students can present entrepreneurial projects and a business model to the business community. The project infuses all core areas.</p>		

Parental involvement in I-Work career readiness plans is sufficient. The LEAs also include sufficient evidence of the provisions to provide behavioral intervention and emotional support to all students. BOCES also mentions mentorship program goals that will increase communication, parental involvement, and promotion of a positive climate.

This plan, although well developed, does not convincingly describe efforts to obtain feedback from students, parents and educators. This plan also does not specify efforts to ensure that students are exposed to diverse cultures and perspectives. A timeline with goals, deliverables and key personnel responsible have not been included. 15 points have been assigned.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan to develop students to be career and college ready is ambitious. Efforts described in the proposal are achievable if the LEAs are awarded funds from the RTTT-D competition. Zones of learning are written in the proposal. Students are expected to be in learning environments that are accessible, have open seating, provide use of technology, allow for demonstrations of understanding, and encourage creativity. Teachers are expected to create environments for students to move freely.

Training for educators in the I-Coach component of the proposal is ambitious. The consortium plans to train master teachers on how to adequately identify and develop the personal needs of students. The timeline for professional development implementation for all teachers is appropriate and comprehensive. It is noted that professional development activities are documents in the My Learning Plan. Educators will not just engage in sit and get professional development. The consortium's goal to provide professional development that engages the learner, allows for self-reflection and collaboration of ideas, and diversifies the needs of the learner, is similar to the goals that the LEAs have established for students within the districts.

The LEAs have mentioned that they have a new evaluation tool used to evaluate teachers and principals. BOCES describes how the tool will rate teachers and principals as ineffective, developing, effective, and highly effective. This plan does not mention how placement of instructors in hard to staff schools and subjects will occur.

The proposal does not mention how the LEAs will link student achievement and data driven decisions to instruction in the personalized learning environment. BOCES has been assigned a score of 14.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
BOCES has written comprehensive efforts it will use to ensure the project will be carried out in accordance to federal requirements. A project administrator will provide programmatic and fiscal supervision. The Core Management Team from each LEA will oversee I-STAY decisions with each LEA having one vote with decisions carried out by the group would need a majority vote. I-STAY advisory team and project administrator will share information among participants.		
Leadership teams in each LEA create their own school calendar, budgets and instructional schedules. BOCES is responsible for creating a regional calendar so that shared planning and professional development can occur. The information provided is reasonable to support efforts autonomy. The LEAs share resources, meet monthly to focus work around the common cores, data driven instruction, and teacher and leader effectiveness.		
The consortium's inquiry learning approaches and creation of portfolios demonstrates extensive efforts to give credits to students based off of mastery and not on amount of time spent. Throughout this proposal the LEA mention efforts to individualize learning for all students. The proposal however does not mention specifically how instructional modifications will be made for students with disabilities and limited English. Thirteen points has been assigned.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Technology assessments will be administered in all schools. Specific strategies to address at home needs of educators, parents, and students are vague.

Training and support for educators has been thoroughly described. The district has made provision to provide regional and individual training and support within the I-Coach, I-Motivate, and I-Work Initiatives. Training will be developed regionally based on individual district needs by our project coordinators. Coordinators will facilitate training of school coaches, administrators, lead teachers and district-level technology staff who will, in turn, train and support school level staff, families, and students. Training and support will be provided as needed to effectively implement individual school PLE strategies.

There is a lack of specific details the LEAs will use to provide technical support to all stakeholders.

The consortium reports that parent portals are utilized to obtain student achievement data but BOCES does not mention the data formats that can be downloaded to share student data with parents.

Details on the My Learning Plan and how it has the ability to share evaluative components and student data is mentioned. The proposal does not clearly specify if data systems store budgetary items and human resource data.

The consortium has not provided ample evidence of school infrastructures to support learning. A rating of 6 has been assigned.

# E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Description of the rubric will be used yearly to provide feedback three times a year to the I-STAY project is sound. The I-STAY advisory board will review data and provide recommendations with the Core Management Team. The LEAs have also described efforts to share school climate data and student behavior data.</p> <p>This plan fails to provide evidence that all stakeholders are included in the process of providing feedback. The advisory board and core management team does not include representation for classroom teachers of the effectiveness of the I-STAY project. The plan also fails to mention complete strategies to share information with the public. 11 points have been assigned.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The communication efforts for sharing information are feasible. The LEAs plan to send "e-blast" to parent teach organizations and boards of education monthly. Other comprehensive efforts of communication include radio and TV stations. Full points have been assigned.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEAs plan to annually measure the effectiveness of their seven initiatives with a rating scale. Targets for students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged are not addressed in performance measures a and b. Targets in performance measure c show no yearly growth. The details of specific rationale for each measure a timely plan for allowing room for improvement is not included in the proposal. A score of 2 has been assigned.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The plan for evaluating effectiveness is clear and concise. BOCES is responsible for overseeing fiscal management with the assistance of the project administrator, core management and advisory teams. Full points have been assigned.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Sustainability efforts are mentioned in the application for each of the seven components of the I-STAY project. There is a lack of specific funding allocations commitment beyond the grant cycle. 3 points have been assigned.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The I-Care component of the I-STAY project is extensive. Within the comprehensive project, the LEAs desire to establish school-based mental health and addiction clinics. The contrarian provides details of previous successes in providing partnerships and mental health services through grant funding. The districts also describe how the previous grant improved achievement in participating schools.  Goals for scaling up the Safe Schools Healthy students project are ambitious. Using a survey to identify high need students in addition to data from attendance, discipline and achievement, the LEAS will create behavioral intervention plans and attempt to increase parental involvement, address student development and academic learning needs and provide intervention services for families. Within the narrative the LEAs do not specifically address what new partnerships will be in all schools. A timeline of goals, deliverables, and assignment of key personnel responsible for implementing the proposal's activities has not fully been addressed. Seven points have been assigned.		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Community partnerships have worked with district personnel, students, and their families for four years. Service providers included Clinton County Adolescent Services, Behavioral Health Services North and Essex Mental Health. The partnerships worked with schools to provide community clinics within five schools. The LEAs have reported tracking of attendance, discipline, and improved academic performance for participating students through partnership interventions. The LEA's goal is to scale-up the model to establish satellite clinics that provide behavior and emotional support to additional students in need.  The model will support school-based efforts. Plans to decrease student behavior and increase student achievement through a screening process have been included but have not been specifically described. The plan does include provisions to work collaboratively with parents. A plan to provide student interventions has not been adequately explained.  Performance measure targets are included but targets are not ambitious.  Specific budget needs were not described.  A plan for professional development for stakeholders has not been addressed.  Five points have been assigned to the applicant.		



## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The outlined plan set expectations for students and adults within the consortium. The plan also empowers stakeholders to be active participants in creating personalized learning environments. I-STAY presents a plan to support the social and emotional development of all students and will provide all students with a career coach to assist with the development of career pathway projects. BOCES has provided evidence of all participating school districts that support of the proposal. I-STAY will address reform in education for all students and will give greater emphasis to students in grades 4-12. BOCES has written their commitment to infuse common core standards into the curricula. Plans to share and monitor performance data are unique.

Zones of learning are written in the proposal to ensure that students are college and career ready. The plan for evaluating effectiveness is clear and concise. BOCES is responsible for overseeing fiscal management with the assistance of the project administrator, core management and advisory teams.

Information on some achievement growth for each LEA has been provided but the LEA did not demonstrate it consistently across content areas. Redesign of high schools and requiring students to participate in additional reading classes if academic expectation are not met are some measures mentioned to provide interventions to struggling learners. Learning strategies were mentioned but not descriptive in some cases. The plan calls for each LEA to remain unique but clear expectations of what will be expected by all individual districts. This plan does not convincingly describe efforts to obtain feedback from students, parents and educators. This plan also does not specify efforts to ensure that students are exposed to diverse cultures and perspectives.

Efforts to remain individualized are clear. Funding this grant would be challenging because in some cases, expectations and desired outcomes vary. The LEAs have not met comprehensively met this priority.

Total	210	158
-------	-----	-----

## Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	11

### Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The Magic STEM Bus will expose students to Science, Technology, Engineering and Math activities and careers. The STEM Bus would travel across the area serving as a mobile classroom on an at-need basis. Through collaboration with Change the Equation(CTEq), this unique learning opportunity can be achieved. Assigning a staff of three is appropriate. Plans to provide professional development, bootcamps, and hands-on lessons in math and science to teachers are reasonable. The LEAs rationale for the project is evident but strategies to support learners are not detailed. Also, budget goals are not specific. Rationales of cost were not provided. The LEA has been assigned a rating of 11 points.